

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer Clerk of the Board of Supervisors 383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration Los Angeles, California 90012

At its meeting held August 5, 2003, the Board took the following action:

65

Fred Bennett, counsel for the Superior Court reported on the recommendations made by the Multi-jurisdictional Traffic School Committee in response to various issues regarding the monitoring and administration of traffic schools to minimize fraud. In addition, Bobbette Glover, Chief Deputy, Housing Authority and Sergeant Steve Miller representing the Sheriff's Department answered questions posed by the Board.

After discussion, on motion of Supervisor Antonovich, seconded by Supervisor Burke, unanimously carried, the Board received and filed the Multi-jurisdictional Traffic School Committee's attached report and comments made by Superior Court, Sheriff and Housing Authority representatives.

8080503-65

Attachment

Copies distributed:

Each Supervisor
Sheriff
Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Executive Director of the Housing Authority
Executive Officer/Clerk of the
Superior Court

Community Development Commission

July 30,2003

TO: Each Supervisor

FROM: Carlos Jackson

SUBJECT: MUL TI-JURISDICTIONAL TRAFFIC SCHOOL COMMITTEE

As requested at the June 3, 2003 Board meeting, provided herein is the report of the Multi-jurisdictional Traffic School Committee. The Committee was established to development a plan that would result in more effective monitoring of traffic violator schools, including steps to detect and prevent the illegal sale of certificates.

The Committee convened three times, with representation from the Housing Authority (HACoLA), the Superior Court, the Chief Administrative Office, the Sheriff's Department, and the Department of Motor Vehicles. The report contains information that staff will be prepared to discuss at the Board's August 5th meeting.

Should the Board accept the Committee's recommendations, contract(s) for HACoLA monitoring services and Sheriff's Department investigative services will be presented for Board approval within 90 days.

The Superior Court proposes to increase the traffic school monitoring fee paid by violators from \$5 to \$15 effective October I' 2003. This timeframe will allow for approvals by Court personnel and preparation of documents to be disseminated to the public.

Representatives from the Committee who will be available for questions at the August 5th Board meeting are: Bobbette Glover of my staff, Federick Bennett of the Superior Court, and Lieutenant Edward Rogner of the Sheriff's Department. If you have questions, Ms. Glover can be reached at (323) 890-7402 and Mr. Bennett at (213) 893-1224.

BG:ajm:traffic1

Attachment

C: Violet Varona-Lukens, Executive Officer Judge David Sotello, Los Angeles Superior Court Each Deputy

July 23, 2003

TO: YVONNE BRATHW AITE BURKE, Chair and Supervisor, Second

District

GLORIA MOLINA, Supervisor, First District ZEV Y AROSLA VSKY, Supervisor, Third District

DON KNABE, Supervisor, Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH, Supervisor, Fifth District

FROM: MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL TRAFFIC SCHOOL COMMITTEE

RE: REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

At its meeting on June 3, 2003, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors instructed the Executive Director of the Housing Authority to establish a Multi-jurisdictional Traffic School Committee with representatives from the County Counsel, the Sheriff, the District Attorney, the Housing Authority of Los Angeles County, the Chief Administrative office, the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Superior court, and to Report back to the Board of Supervisors at the meeting of August 5, 2003, recommendations on the following questions:

- 1. Can effective monitoring of State licensed traffic schools be done under the existing statutory scheme or should the County seek the passage of facilitating legislation?
- 2. Should the Court increase the traffic school monitoring fee, and if so, by how much, to permit enhanced County monitoring and Court administration without discouraging attendance at traffic schools or increasing litigated cases?
- 3. Are there effective traffic school programs in other counties that are appropriate for Los Angeles County?

Report and Recommendations

- 1. Effective monitoring of State licensed traffic schools can be done under the existing statutory scheme. However, "home study" and Internet based driver education varies from county to county, and is not subject to state regulations. The County should work with the Court to seek state licensing and regulation of "home study" and Internet based driver education, and the Court should evaluate the feasability of developing more effective court approved programs of driver education.
- 2. The Court should increase the traffic school monitoring fee from \$5 to \$15, which is comparable to similar fees in other counties, to permit enhanced County monitoring and Court administration, and to establish a reserve for additional monitoring and administration ofboth state licensed and court approved programs of driver education.

Such a fee increase should provide approximately \$2 million to the Housing Authority and the Sheriff for increased monitoring and fraud investigation, \$4 million to reimburse Court administration costs, and create a \$1.5 million dollar reserve for additional monitoring and administration, as well as the development of Court approved Court or County operated programs of driver education that may be more effective and affordable, and less subject to fraud than privately operated, state licensed traffic schools.

3. Traffic programs in Ventura and Orange County suggest that county or court operated programs of drivers education may be more effective and affordable, and less subject to fraud than privately operated programs. The Court should further study the feasibility of Court or County operated programs as an alternative to or in addition to privately operated programs.